Hilliard Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hilliard Elementary School

27568 OHIO ST, Hilliard, FL 32046

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hilliard Elementary is committed to an educational process, involving the total community, which encourages each child to become a lifelong learner and provides the necessary resources to enable each student to develop into a responsible, productive citizen prepared to enter secondary education with both academic and social success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Tracy	Assistant Principal	
Loudermilk, Celena	Principal	
Tilley, Rhonda	School Counselor	
Byous, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
Rose, Anna	Teacher, K-12	
Starling, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Olman, Joeal	Teacher, K-12	
Carter, Latasha	Teacher, ESE	
Parr, Debra	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team is comprised of leaders in each job category at Hilliard Elementary School. The leadership team is comprised of administration, grade level chairs, and guidance. The school leadership team is involved in the analysis of data needed for the SIP. The leadership team also helps draft the SIP goals and action steps each year. This involvement is necessary as these members ensure that all action items are carried out with fidelity.

In addition, Hilliard Elementary develops a School Advisory Committee according to state guidelines. Each year the SAC offer feedback and vote to approve the current SIP. They also review mid year data

and work with the school to complete a Mid Year Reflection. Finally, the SAC also offer end of year feedback and insight into Title I funds and expenditures.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Monitoring must occur regularly and continuously in order to ensure our strategies and interventions are being successful. Monitoring of our SIP goals and strategies begin at the classroom level. Teachers regularly complete test item analysis following the administration of each test. Useful information is gained from this, and is used to make instructional decisions to close gaps in learning. Planning teams complete a similar process to ensure we are appropriately covering material, and teaching it to the level of rigor the state standard was written to. Related trends by subgroups or demographics are analyzed during the instructional planning process. Revisions or adjustments to the plan are made as needed in order to ensure the plan remains relevant and effective.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	15%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	20	29	20	17	20	18	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	5	15	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	16

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	3	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	39	28	26	19	21	24	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	5	6	4	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	6	13	7	6	6	0	0	0	58

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	7	4	9	5	8	6	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	39	28	26	19	21	24	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	5	6	4	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	6	13	7	6	6	0	0	0	58

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	7	4	9	5	8	6	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement*	76	69	56	78	76	57
ELA Learning Gains	67	66	61	65	65	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55	54	52	60	54	53
Math Achievement*	87	81	60	91	85	63
Math Learning Gains	59	70	64	79	77	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60	64	55	82	67	51
Science Achievement*	71	70	51	76	75	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	63			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP				
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	76	67	55	87	59	60	71					
SWD	60	53	50	85	63	80	47					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70			80								
HSP												
MUL	75	70		100	70							
PAC												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
WHT	76	66	51	86	59	59	71					
FRL	69	60	51	82	52	62	65					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	76	73	57	91	76	61	75					
SWD	54	50		81	69		75					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			100								
HSP												
MUL	77			92								
PAC												
WHT	77	76	63	91	76	61	77					
FRL	71	70	53	88	75	59	72					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	78	65	60	91	79	82	76					
SWD	65	54	67	85	66	93	53					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67	30		93	80							
HSP												
MUL	61	50		83	83							
PAC												
WHT	80	67	64	92	79	82	77					
FRL	76	63	60	89	78	80	76					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	73%	0%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	69%	3%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	87%	76%	11%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	78%	9%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	89%	81%	8%	55%	34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	69%	-5%	51%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The 22-23 School year indicated that school wide our ELA performance was lower than our Mathematics performance. According to our F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 data, our school wide Mathematics proficiency rate was 80% compared to our ELA performance of 70%. Although 3rd grade increased from 69% to 72%, 4th grade declined from 84 to 71%, and 5th grade declined from 74% to 72%. A contributing factor is related to the new B.E.S.T standards as well as the adoption of new curriculum. New standards can create learning curves for educators and educational gaps for learners due to missing foundational knowledge. Additionally, 50% of the 4th and 5th grade ELA staff were comprised of brand new ELA teachers.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

As stated above, our ELA performance in 3rd-5th grade resulted in 70% of students achieving proficiency. 4th grade declined from 84 to 71%, and 5th grade declined from 74% to 72%. A contributing factor is related to the new B.E.S.T standards as well as the adoption of new curriculum. New standards can create learning curves for educators and educational gaps for learners due to missing foundational knowledge. Additionally, 50% of the 4th and 5th grade ELA staff were comprised of brand new ELA teachers.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All performance indicators were above the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math in 3rd through 5th grade consistently showed the greatest improvements from Progress Monitoring Session 1 to Progress Monitoring Session 3.
3rd grade proficiency increased from 14% to 87%
4th grade proficiency increased from 17% to 88%
5th grade proficiency increased from 23% to 88%

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The Early Warning System data indicated increased concerns for students with a deficiency in ELA.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Hilliard Elementary School
1. Increase ELA proficiency rate in K-2nd grade in phonics.
2. Increase ELA proficiency rate in 3rd-5th grade.
3. Incorporate Resiliency Skill instruction into the daily routine of K-2nd grade.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hilliard Elementary School will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 23-24 ELA PM3 F.A.S.T Assessment. Our 3rd grade ELA scores improved for the 22-23 school year compared to the 21-22 school year, but there is still a need to decrease the percentage of students performing below the proficiency level. Students becoming proficient readers is foundational for success in other subjects. If we continue to meet the needs of all learners the percentage of students not proficient will continue to decrease.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Hilliard Elementary School will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher from 30% on the 2022-2023 PM3 F.A.S.T. assessment to 27% on the 2023-2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Literacy Leadership team will monitor school-wide progress by dissecting our results from FAST and STAR assessments as tested three times per year.

Grade levels meet weekly to perform a test item analysis on the most recent assessment. The dissected data is then used to make instructional decisions for the next several weeks of instruction. Administration meets with the School Literacy Team and Leadership Team to discuss school wide data and grade level data in order to guide teachers through instructional grouping practices, provide teachers a data review, and provide instructional planning sessions. Many students are also served through our MTSS process to help ensure they are successful in the general education classroom. Grade levels review the MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies monthly as needed.

Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and/or the Literacy Coach will progress monitor using the following resources as applicable: Sonday, Phonics screeners, Level Literacy Instruction LLI, and Benchmark Quick Checks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

3rd through 5th grade students received daily small group differentiated phonics instruction and standards-based remedial standards-based reading curriculum instruction as part of their 90-minute reading block. The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program, Freckle, and Sonday System are also used to provide Tier 3 interventions.

Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)-(strong evidence-per Evidence for ESSA)

Sonday System program aligns with the IES Practice Guided recommendations. (Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 5th grade.)

Additional Evidenced Based Interventions:

-Small Group Instruction
-After school tutoring is provided for students in the lowest quartile.
-Preferential scheduling with our students with disabilities.

Provided professional development for teachers in the following area:
-Data-driven instruction
-Practice Profiles- Explicit and Scaffolded Instruction
-Gradual Release Method

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of small group instruction is to address learning deficits. We must meet our students where they are academically. When students are placed in small groups of 2 to 7 and provided direct instructional support, student success increases. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so we can move forward toward on level instruction.

The use of the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program provides educators effective intervention resources and strategies that allow students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency within the five reading components.
By using the Sonday System to target crucial foundational skills to students who are exhibiting extreme deficits in phonics and phonemic awareness.

We must also continue to provide professional development for teachers in how to provide quality research-based instruction. Teachers must continue to develop skills in the areas of explicit and scaffolded instruction, and engagement strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be guided through explicit ELA instruction using anchor charts and think aloud strategies for both phonics and comprehension. Teachers will explicitly teach students to use the phonics coding and comprehension strategies to become proficient readers.

Step1: Data Analysis with Leadership Team
Step 2: Professional Development of Lit Team
-explicit coding strategy that is vertically aligned
-explicit phonics instruction planning guide
-use of data to differentiate
-explicit word attack strategies that are vertically aligned & embedded in small group instruction
Step 3: Professional Development of Teachers
-New Teacher Saxon Training
-Peer Observations
-Mentor/Mentee Focal Point
-Admin/Reading Coach Modeling

-Thinking Thursdays led by Reading Coach, Admin, & Lit Team
Step 4: Teacher Implementation
-Reflective Peer Observations
-Mentor/Mentee Focal Point
-Admin/Reading Coach Reflective Observations
Step 5: Student Implementation
-In-school small group instruction and K-1st grade intervention
-Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
-After school tutoring of the lowest quartile with specific instruction based
on Phonics and Comprehension goals as evidenced in student data

Person Responsible: Celena Loudermilk (loudermilk.ce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teachers will be trained and/or provided materials on how to explicitly model, teach, and practice appropriate social/resiliency skills to assist students with identifying, regulating, and communicating their needs, wants, and day to day interactions.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Hilliard Elementary School will decrease the number of school related discipline referrals by 3%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school Leadership Team and Threat Assessment Team will monitor school-wide progress by analyzing MTSS behavior data as well as FOCUS recorded school discipline data.

The Threat Assessment and Leadership teams meet monthly and additionally as needed to discuss school-wide behavioral initiatives as well as individual student and classroom concerns. The dissected data is then used to make instructional decisions for monthly initiatives and interventions centered around Resiliency and age appropriate social skill instruction. Many students are also served through our MTSS process to help ensure they are successful in the general education classroom. Grade levels review the MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies monthly as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Miller (millertr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Step1: Purchased and prepared items for Skillstreaming research-based social skills curriculum
Step 2: Disperse materials and train teachers on using materials
Step 3: Lesson planning using approved picture books and Skillstreaming skill cards to support the following
Resiliency skills: Citizenship, Honesty, Personal Responsibility, Gratitude, Empathy, Grit, Perseverance, Problem Solving, Volunteerism / Mentorship, and Critical Thinking.
Step 4: 3rd-5th grade students will receive education in Resiliency Skills through the programs: Botvin Life Skills
Training, and the D.A.R.E. program
Step 5: Implementation
-Collaboration across county
-Collaboration across grade levels
-Admin observation

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of instruction in Resiliency and Social Skills is to address Tier I student deficiencies in identifying, regulating, and communicating their needs, wants, and day to day interactions. We must meet our students where they are socially when coming from various background experiences. When students are provided direct instructional support in utilizing Resiliency strategies to work collaboratively and solve problems, student success increases in and outside of the classroom. This will ensure social learning

gaps are filled so we can move forward toward academic instruction.

The use of the Skillstreaming program provides educators effective intervention resources through modeling, role-playing, performance feedback, and generalization—to teach essential prosocial skills and strategies that allow students to apply each concept in real-life situations to build communication and confidence within the classroom setting.

We must also continue to provide professional development for teachers in how to provide quality research-based instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Hilliard Elementary School analyzes subgroup achievement data to develop our Title I Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and School Improvement Plan (SIP). Both plans are discussed, evaluated, and voted on at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Our Title I CNA outlines how we plan to fund 1.) student needs (e.g., supplies, paraprofessionals, technology programs), 2.) parent and family engagement needs (e.g., parent nights, parent communication), 3.) curriculum development needs (e.g., data chats, planning days), and 4.) professional development needs (e.g., teacher walkthroughs, B.E.S.T. standards and Benchmark training). The CNA must be developed with participation from individuals that carry out school-wide program plans including teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. Our CNA is available upon request. A paper copy of our SIP is available in our front office and a digital copy can be viewed on our school's website. Both the paper copy and digital copy are referenced on our monthly school calendars, so that all school stakeholders are aware of the various methods of dissemination. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Hilliard Elementary School continually strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. To achieve our goal in fulfilling our school's mission for parent and family engagement, we follow a process that starts at our spring School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. At this meeting, we evaluate the results of our current year's Title I Parent Survey and school-level Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Topics of discussion include flexible parent nights and meetings, progress monitoring of students, parent communication, barriers to parent involvement, and professional development to effectively train our staff on bridging the gap between school and home. Additionally, we reflect on parents' survey results indicating if they feel valued, respected, and welcomed at our school. The information gleaned at this meeting, along with insight gathered from weekly collaboration meetings, leadership team meetings, faculty meetings, and parent teacher meetings gives us a comprehensive look into our school's ability to build positive relationships with our school stakeholders. If an area of focus does not meet our level of expectations, we set goals and establish priorities for the upcoming school year and reassess them in the spring. The Hilliard Elementary School PFEP is available on our school website and in our front office. Our monthly calendars and newsletters state where this plan can be accessed. Our district PFEP is available on our Nassau County School District website. The Title I Handbook-Desk Reference is disseminated to all families at the start of each school year, and it outlines how to access the district PFEP. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

HES uses Title 1 funds to hire additional personnel to assist in the classroom with small group ELA and Math instruction and provide academic remediation. Teacher professional development in the instructional areas of need in ELA are funded through the Title I program. Technology programs such as

Lexia Core and IXL are utilized to strengthen students' phonics, phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. School-wide tutoring and intervention programs are also in place to provide additional intervention and remediation.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Hilliard Elementary School's School-Wide Program Plan is developed with participation from teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. We work with our Title I department and Food Service department to determine our school's free and reduced lunch count, which dictates our Title I allocation. Hilliard Elementary School and the Title I department work closely with other federal programs, including Title II and Title III to pinpoint staff development opportunities and to improve the achievement of our ELL student population. We collaborate with Head Start programs to effectively transition our preschool children to kindergarten. We work with our Director of Intervention Prevention, and Safety Services to ensure interventions are in place for our homeless students, foster care students, and neglected and delinquent students. We collaborate with our ESE department to provide specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of our students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The district utilizes the tiered process to provide support to students in need of school-based mental health services and specialized support services in order to help them to access the educational environment. In addition, if a student is experiencing an acute crisis, the mental health provider which is typically the school social worker can connect with the student through a system of care process to determine what supports, if any, may be needed either in or out of the school environment.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The district utilizes the MTSS approach to prevent and address problem behavior. With PBIS, the school teams provide preventative support. If this is not sufficient, the school based problem solving team will convene to determine additional intervention supports. If these supports need to be ongoing and continuous or significantly differ in intensity and duration from what can be provided solely through general education resources to make or maintain sufficient progress, then the team will consider the need for services via IDEA (e.g., consider need for a psychoeducational evaluation, monitor the need for specialized instruction, etc.).

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

HES level Professional Development includes:
-Scaffolded and Explicit Instruction
-Data Analysis
-Phonics Instruction

District level PD includes:
Rethinking Behavior/Flip It
Power Struggles
Explicit/Scaffolded Instruction
Specially Designed Instruction

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Nassau County School District works in collaboration with other early childhood education agencies to ensure a smooth transition to our local school programs. (ie. Head Start, Child Find)

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No